

## **D R A F T**

### **Meeting Minutes, 6/16/05**

#### **Committee for Citizen Involvement**

CCI Members Present: Sue Carver, Basil Christopher, Teddi Duling, Bev Froude, Rich Parker, Stacie Yost, Trisha Swanson

CCI Members Absent: Brian Kelly, Bill Scheiderich, Robert Cancelosi

Staff Present: Dick Bewersdorff, Tom Imdieke, Diane Jelderks, Duane Roberts,

#### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order by Duane Roberts at 7:07 p.m. He announced that a non-agenda item had been added to the agenda. He introduced Tom Imdieke, Interim Financial Director, who was present at Council's direction to discuss with the CCI the formation of a Financial Strategy Task Force. He also announced that this would be the first item on the agenda following the approval of the May 19, 2005, meeting minutes.

The draft minutes were approved without change by unanimous consent.

#### **2. Financial Strategy Task Force**

Tom Imdieke began his presentation by explaining that Council had just adopted the FY 05-06 budget using a complicated process. To address the financial future, Council and the Budget Committee wish to create a financial strategy task force, consisting of the Budget Committee and representatives of the CCI, Downtown, and Transportation Committees. The goal would be to make specific recommendations to Council regarding the revenue side of the City budget. This includes looking at new ways to control the cost of health insurance, fuel costs, etc. The committee will examine the factors that have been serving to drive costs upward. According to Tom, Council is "asking for the review of not simply potential revenue sources, but also what further steps can be taken to control City expenditures and/or alternative ways of delivering City services."

The concept is that the committee would be short term, or five to six months in duration. The proposed work schedule is one three-hour meeting per month. Tom commented that the reason Council is interested in the participation of members of existing groups is that the CCI and other standing committees "would come to the table with a broad perspective and understanding of city programs and would have a running start" in looking at cost controls. He indicated that Council expects to follow the recommendations put forward by the task force. Council is scheduled

to adopt on July 12th a resolution establishing the task force and appointing its members.

Bev asked if the task force would include some or all Budget Committee members. Tom responded that it would include all. "The task force membership would be composed of the five citizen members of the Budget Committee, all interested members of the CCI, and a member each from the Downtown Task Force and the Transportation Financial Strategies Task Force".

Trish wanted to know if task force members would need to commit to attending all the meetings. Tom indicated that "we would like to have as much participation from each appointed member as possible." She asked if each meeting would build on the previous meeting. Tom responded that he couldn't answer the question, because the details of the task force's work plan have not been worked out as yet. The meeting dates will be the second or fourth Wednesday's starting in August.

Rich asked if the work of the task force could be described as developing a business plan. Tom said "not exactly". The focus will be on recommendations on how to keep costs down based on the life experiences of task force members. The content of the recommendations is open-ended, except that they should be budget-specific as opposed to relating to overall financial policy.

Teddi commented that the limited life of the task force would make it possible for her to volunteer to serve on it.

Basil commented that he was unsure what the new task force would be doing. "A lot of times a public body in similar situations will go out to the public for input as opposed to asking existing committee members to 'double-up'." Tom responded that Council has turned to the CCI in particular because it is looking for a cross section of people with experience in the functioning of local government. He also mentioned that in light of the volunteer time the CCI and other citizen committee members are already contributing, "everyone is not asked to attend every meeting."

### **3. Neighborhood Program Update**

Duane informed the committee that Liz Newton has been focusing on organizing the pilot program and will be present at next month's meeting to update the CCI. Other than this, she informed Duane that nothing new has happened since her May CCI status report.

### **4. City Capital Project Notification Policies and Practices**

Duane introduced Diane Jelderks, Engineering Department Administrative Assistant and designated "Communicator". The latter title means that she serves as the department's representative on the all-department Communications Committee and also coordinates all department capital project communication

efforts. Diane began by giving an overview of her department's communication program. She explained that Engineering's public notice efforts begin with the annual Capital Improvement Plan public notice process. Information on the nomination and selection of projects for inclusion in the 7-year capital improvement plan begins in late winter-early spring, with city webpage postings. The communication strategy for each individual project is based on its size, with bigger projects receiving the biggest effort. The notice process begins sometime before a project is scheduled for implementation and can include the use of local newspaper notices and a range of other communication tools. Regardless of size, project signs are posted on every project site and every owner of abutting property receives an individual notice. If the timing matches-up, a story is included in the Cityscape newsletter, which currently is mailed to every household and business located inside the City.

Diane concluded by saying that the department is open to any suggestions on how to improve its public notice process and on how to get more public participation in the nomination and selection of projects for inclusion in the annual CIP. The general rule the department follows is to "use as many communication tools as match the size and impact of the project."

Duane asked Diane if she were familiar with the circumstances involved in the project that CCI member Robert Cancelosi brought to the committee's attention last week. Diane said that she was very familiar with this project. It was a private development project that the City undertook to complete, because the developer had gone out of business before doing so. The work involved erosion control improvement in the back yard of a few properties. She described this as a project where the public notice process was not followed. It also occurred at a time when she was on vacation. As a City resident herself, she "constantly urges" the use of good citizen communications.

Stacie asked if the communications breakdown in the case of this particular project was an exception or isolated case. Diane confirmed that it was a unique, cross department project, that was overseen by a manager who was handling his first public project and who was unfamiliar with the communication guidelines.

Sue brought up the example of the extension of a sewer line through a landscaped yard within her neighborhood. When she called the City about the project, she was given the wrong information. Diane responded that she didn't know the particulars of this particular project, but speculated that Sue may have called during a several week period this spring, when one of the two Permit Technician positions, the initial contact for most capital project questions, was unfilled. Planning staff helped out during this period, and could have been the staff responsible for giving out the wrong information. Sue commented that the location of the project in question was 98th and Murdock. She also commented that this was the first time she had ever been given bad information by City staff.

Trisha asked about individual notice procedures. Among other comments, Diane mentioned that door hangers are used for construction projects. Teddi suggested the addition of the CPO newsletters to the list of communication devices presently used in order to reach a broader group of people.

Basil commented on the process used to collect feedback from citizens on the effectiveness of capital project notifications. He suggested using comment cards that affected citizens could fill out and return to the engineering department. The department would then have "a report card on themselves." Diane expressed support for this idea, saying that she would urge her department to consider its adoption and use.

Basil also commented that in the case of street overlay projects, only abutting properties are notified at present. As an example of how the County operates, he brought up the case of the Washington County overlay of a local Tigard street. The County provided no notice of the project, which is standard practice for the County. He commented that overlays improve the condition of streets, but on the other hand, he noticed that people start driving faster on them.

Bev commented that the Street Maintenance Fee (SMF) signs are an effective communication tool. If streets are to be closed for paving, she recommended following the SMF model and putting up information signs at least one week prior to the start of work.

Stacie commented that she drives on Ashford and 79th to get to her house. She checked on the city webpage and found no information on a 79th Street Local Improvement District (LID) that she had heard about. She searched other sources and found nothing on these, either. Diane explained that a 79th LID had not been a project on the regular CIP list. A private developer had asked the City to initiate an LID. The LID idea was short-lived. It was dropped after neighborhood residents expressed opposition to it.

Brian asked how Council can allocate money for a project that is not listed and budgeted in the approved CIP. Bev commented that the owners of property within a proposed LID need to support the improvement district before it can be formed. Council can initiate information gathering, but cannot establish an LID without the project having a certain level of public support.

## **5. Land Use Neighborhood Meeting Process**

This item was continued from last month's CCI meeting. Duane introduced Dick Bewersdorff, Tigard Planning Manager. Dick informed the group that some developers cut corners and do not make a good faith effort to let people know "what its going on" with a proposed development project. The idea of the Neighborhood Meeting is to provide basic information to affected residents. If the person

representing the developer at the meeting is uninformed and can't provide any details about the project, the developer is not meeting the City requirement.

Bev commented that the use of a mediator may be helpful in the case of controversial projects. She also noted that an undue number of changes can occur between the Neighborhood Meeting and the application. Dick responded that the idea is to let affected residents know "what is happening" around them. The details of the project go to staff, who are available to answer questions about the project and are the most reliable information source. Dick indicated that "there are some good and some less good developers." Project applications are returned if they are incomplete. Staff's role is to review the details of a project to see if it meets development code standards.

Trisha agreed with Bev and asked if it would be useful to have facilitators participate in neighborhood meetings. Dick responded that he thought this would be helpful in some cases, depending on the type and scale of the project proposal. The facilitator or staff would need to select which meetings to attend. As mandated by state statutes, staff have 120 days to complete their review of a project. The Neighborhood Meeting is the direct contact between the developer and neighbors. It is designed to provide a better understanding of the project and, since its seven-year-ago implementation, has been successful in reducing the number of legal appeals. Part of the City customer service is balancing the interests of the developer and the neighbors. If the development follows the rules and standards, the City is obligated to approve the project. He added for the group's information that Ballot Measure 37 prohibits the loss of development rights by a change in the comprehensive plan. The ballot measure establishes a new rule the City is required to follow. "Depending on when the owner acquired property, some people will have added property rights."

Bev commented that Neighborhood Meeting participants need to know the review process to be followed for each individual application. Dick responded that "interpreting which process will apply" is difficult to do. In some cases, such as Subdivisions versus Planned Developments [includes flexible standards designed to preserve open space and promote the efficient use of land], the developer may not have decided beforehand the process under which to apply or may choose to follow a different process based on what he or she hears at the neighborhood meeting.

Basil asked "who decides the notice distance." Dick answered that the state mandated minimum distance is 250 feet. The City has doubled this to 500 feet. Basil questioned whether 500 feet continues to be an acceptable distance. Dick answered that the City goes by state law combined with the need to manage costs. Basil asked about the feasibility of using an email notification system. Dick commented that it would be difficult to keep track of email notices. Basil asked how the City determines the "community impact" of a development. He said notification distance should be variable and based type and scale of the project involved as well as community perceptions of its potential impact.

Dick pointed out that information on each project goes onto the City webpage. [All Subdivision pre-applications and proposals and all land use decisions, including site maps, are listed. Application or proposal summaries are provided for Subdivisions and Planned Unit Developments. The complete, multi-page document is included in the case of land use decisions. The web address is City homepage/Community Development Department/Current Planning/Land Use]

Bev commented that the posted notices can't be read from a moving car. She suggested that the site signs should be larger and color coded by type of development as a way of addressing this problem.

Basil commented that the CCI's role is to give feedback to the City on behalf of the community. The use of bigger, easier-to-read signs should be viewed not just as a CCI comment, but as a community comment and request. He also suggested that the land use development meetings should be held as part of the new Neighborhood Program meetings.

Stacie indicated that she had never attended a neighborhood meeting and therefore could not comment on them.

Brian asked if there were "any way to determine the need for a second neighborhood meeting." Dick commented that the ultimate decision is based on the code. According to the code, a "substantial change in a land use application" triggers a requirement to "redo the meeting". What constitutes a substantial change is often a judgment call. "Development doesn't make people happy."

Bev commented that City participation in the neighborhood meeting process would have the effect of "drawing people together." If there are practical problems in having staff attend meetings, the City needs to figure out how to make it work.

Although it is not mandatory at this time, Dick has suggested to developers that they tape record the meetings. He pointed out that the developer has to respond to neighborhood comments received at the meeting. The City reviews the meeting notes provided by the developer. Many times the developer will not respond by amending a project because the comments and requests are not related to legal requirements.

For next meeting Basil requested a layout of the next steps in the pilot program and also for the full implementation of the program. The CCI should have input on the details of how the program is carried out as opposed to "just serving as a rubber stamp."

## **6. Other Business**

Basil commented that the neighborhood concept should include "a list of things neighborhood groups could focus on." The CCI's role is to "provide input as well as

to help sell the Neighborhood Program.” Its role is not to serve a rubber stamp for staff proposals.

The meeting ended at 8:35 PM.

**Next Meeting: Thursday, July 21, 2005 Tigard City Hall, Red Rock Conference Room.**

Tentative agenda items:

- Election of Officers
- Complete Mission Statement
- Neighborhood Program Update
- Capital Project Notification & Neighborhood Meeting Recommendations

i/lrpn/dr/cciminutes.june.05